

December 1, 2004  
Case No. GP-301244 (2760/22)  
Serial No.: 10/000,268  
Filed: November 2, 2001  
Page 7 of 9

**- REMARKS -**

**A. Claim 1 was objected to due to informalities**

Claim 1 has been amended to correct informalities and not to avoid any reference. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is requested.

**B. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mölne in view of Kakinuma**

The §103(a) rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 is traversed.

In order to maintain this §103(a) rejection, each and every element of the claims must be taught or suggested in the reference in at least as great detail as claimed. At a minimum, Mölne in view of Kakinuma fails to teach or suggest "selecting a secondary channel that is not in the system access list portion in response to a failed connection notification from channels in the system access list portion" as claimed in claims 1, 11 and 16.

The Examiner correctly recognizes the failure of Mölne to make any such teaching, and relies on Kakinuma. However, at most, Kakinuma teaches that a notification can be realized by defining the communication regulation information within a signal for notifying the rejection of the call origination request from the mobile station. See, e.g. Kakinuma, column 5, lines 58-61.

As Mölne in view of Kakinuma does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 11, and 16 and claims 2-6, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-20 depending from those claims.

**C. Claims 7, 12, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mölne in view of Kakinuma in further view of Lintulampi**

The §103(a) rejection of claims 7, 12, and 17 is traversed. Claims 7, 12, and 17 depend from claims 1, 11, and 16 respectively, and are therefore patentable over Mölne in view of Kakinuma in further view of Lintulampi for at least the reasons above. Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 7, 12, and 17 is requested.

December 1, 2004

Case No. GP-301244 (2760/22)

Serial No.: 10/000,268

Filed: November 2, 2001

Page 8 of 9

**D. New claims**

New claims 21-24 are patentable over the prior art, as the prior art, alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every claimed element of new claims 21-24.

December 1, 2004  
Case No. GP-301244 (2760/22)  
Serial No.: 10/000,268  
Filed: November 2, 2001  
Page 9 of 9

**SUMMARY**


The Examiner's rejections of claims 1-20 have been obviated by amendments and remarks herein supporting an allowance of pending claims 1-20 over the art of record. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-24 herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: December 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,  
WILLIAM MAZZARA

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION  
General Motors Legal Staff  
Mail Code 482-C23-B21  
300 Renaissance Center  
P.O. Box 300  
Detroit, MI 58265-3000  
Phone: (313) 665-4714

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113



Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicants